DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 264 209 SP 026 820

AUTHOR Allison, Clinton B.
TITLE The Education Professoriate: A Review of the Literature.
PUB DATE Apr 85
NOTE 17p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (69th, Chicago, IL, March 31-April 4, 1985).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Rank (Professional); College Faculty; *Educational Attitudes; Higher Education; *Professional Recognition; Social Attitudes; Teacher Education; *Teacher Educators

ABSTRACT

This review of literature on teacher educators points out that much of the literature divides the professoriate into two groups: those who see education as an academic field, and those who see it as a professional field. The professoriate has also been classified into three categories based upon their traditional professional orientation: (1) disciplinists--those who feed upon and sometimes contribute to one of the social sciences (educational historians or sociologists); (2) generalists--those whose field is educational matters, broadly conceived (professors of curriculum, higher education, or educational administration); and (3) pedagogists--those concerned with the transmission of pedagogical techniques and materials (methods professors). Relations among the three appear to be a somewhat uneasy alliance, and the disciplinists tend to be the most respected members of a low status group within academic circles. Other writers have seen the professoriate as educators who see their job as a realistic attempt to develop valid professional knowledge and professional technical culture suited to the needs of public school practitioners. A brief exploration is also made into literature on teacher educators in other countries (in particular the Soviet Union and Great Britain) and some similaries and differences in attitudes in these countries and the United States toward the professoriate are pointed out. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED264209

THE EDUCATION PROFESSORIATE: A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

by

Clinton B. Allison

SP# 026820

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. Allison

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association in Chicago, April, 1985

For a professor of education to review the literature on the education professoriate is an exercise in masochism. We are used to unflattering portraits from our severest critics outside the profession. James Koermer found us, in one of his better moments, "a sincere, humanitarian, well-intentioned, hard-working, poorly informed, badly educated, and ineffectual group of men and women."[1] And, one of our own, Theodore Sizer, reminds us of that.[2]

> Few academic stereotypes are as pathetic as that of the professor of education...he (or she) is gentle, unintellectual, saccharine, and well-meaning, the bumbling doctor of undiagnosable ills, harmless if morosely defensive. He is either a mechanic (or cook, as the picture usually paints him purveying "cook-book recipes" of pedagogy) or he is the flatulent promotor of irrelevant trivia...(full) of silly jargon and grotesque excesses.

In my study of teacher education in The University of Tennessee, I have searched for evidence of a lack of esteem for education professors that might lead to discrimination in university support. The first professor of pedagogy in the teachers department, created in 1891, had been a professor of philosophy and psychology. Thomas Karns seemed to be well-thought of by the faculty and popular with students. We are off to a good start, no weak stereotype here. Alas, I later discover through students' newspapers and "literary" magazines that this life-long bachelor was called sister by other faculty and Aunt Polly by a generation of undergraduates, in part, because he was such an easy mark. And so it goes.

A major problem of any review of "the literature" is defining the boundaries. I found them particularly difficult to locate on the educational professoriate. On one side I was pulled toward general studies of the American professor, on the other to a massive and frightening body of literature on teacher education generally--its problems and proposals for reform. I have tried to review such literature only when it explicitly

addresses itself to the education professoriate. Alas, my discipline sometimes breaks down.

The two major studies on the education professoriate deserve special mention. The first, edited by Counelis, was published in 1969. It was a project of the Phi Delta Kappa Commissioner on Higher Education. Its stated theme lacked scholarly restraint: "the qualitative improvement of the education professoriate through inducing professional ferment." "The treatment" according to the preface, was "intended to be descriptive and expository rather than impressionistic, prescriptive, and overly normative."[3] I pondered what that meant for a while, then, willy-nilly, went on to other things.

The other major (and more valuable) study, published in 1975 by the Society of Professors of Education and edited by Ayres Bagley, was The Professor of Education: An Assessment of Conditions.[4] Both are collections of free standing essays; there is a lack of coherence among the articles; indeed, the authors often contradict each other. Much of the literature of the professoriate is to be found in publications of the Society of Professors of Education, a problem in that the monographs and occasional papers of the society are not widely disseminated.

The educationist is expected to live in two alien and antagonistic cultures at the same time. He is either a Sioux Indian working in an East Side haberdashery or a gay clothes designer helping on a West Texas roundup. The theme of the two cultures is explicit in Borrowman's The Liberal and Technical in Teacher Education, but it is omnipresent, if sometimes implicit, in the literature of the education professoriate generally.[5] The cultures of the public schools and the universities share surprisingly little in values, goals, or (to be imprecise) style. As an example Judy Pickle contrasts the

perspectives of the two groups by their responses to videotapes of classroom activities. The scholars tend to see the classroom incidents "in an abstract broad social context," finding evidence of capitalism or the problem of "the survival of individuals in institutions." Classroom teachers tend to respond with testimony from their personal experience, particularly on discipline problems, and practical advice "such as cutting down classroom noise by using pieces of felt on hard table tops when children played games."[6] Much of the literature divides the professoriate into these two groups--between those who see education as an academic field and those who see it as a professional field--Finkelstein labels them Technicians and Mandarins.[7] Jackson classifies the professoriate into three groups based on their traditional professional orientation--disciplinists (those who feed upon and sometimes contribute to one of the social sciences)--educational historians or sociologists; generalists (those whose field is educational matters, broadly conceived)--professors of curriculum, higher education, or educational administration); and pedagogists (those concerned with the transmission of pedagogical techniques and materials)--methods professors. He finds relations among the three to be somewhere between an uneasy alliance and bloodshed. The disciplinists tend to be the most respected members of a low status group within academic circles.[8]

Finkelstein proposes a third type--a witness "representing neither a retreat into split-level houses of intellect, nor a withdrawal into labs and clinics, but into shifting communities comprised of Mandarins on the one hand and Technicists on the other."[9] Powell and Sizer, on the other hand, argues that the education professoriate needs "a deliberate effort to merge or fuse <u>in individuals</u> certain traditionally polarized styles of thought and inquiry,

polarized especially along lines of experience vs. methodology or practice vs. theory."[10]

In a contrary position, Walberg unabashedly pursues the higher status that comes to the scholar/researcher in the university. He would set the researchers and practitioners further apart by separating Ph.D. candidates from Ed.D. students, placing the Ph.D.'s in the graduate school of arts and sciences so their programs could have as much scholarly rigor as other Ph.D.'s. Schools of Education could then recruit faculty from the two groups according to their needs.[11]

Other writers would have the professoriate cast their lot with the public schools. Howsam argues that education professors are professional educators who should not be seduced into the lifestyle of liberal arts academicians. Their job is to develop valid professional knowledge and professional technical culture suited to the needs of public school practitioners.[12] Gore goes further, arguing that teacher training must be both more practice oriented and more closely associated with schools than university-based teacher education can possibly be. "Unfortunately," he writes, "our self-consciousness in relation to our academic colleagues may inhibit acceptance," of quality teacher education, including collegial relationship with teachers in teacher training.[13]

Aside from institutional histories of teacher education there is not an extensive literature on the history of the education professoriate. Borrowman's Liberal and Technical was a seminal work. Johanningmeier and Johnson offer a concise and thoughtful essay in the 1975 Society of Professors of Education Monograph.[14] Powell and Sizer provide a first-rate historical sketch in the 1969 PDK publication.[15] They picture the first generation of education professors in the late 19th century trying to create a subject for

study from relevant pieces of psychology, history, and philosophy--as these subjects were emerging into modern disciplines. They found this effort difficult and time-consuming, and they eventually abandoned it. Professors, often fresh from the public schools, found it easier to organize the teacher-education curriculum around school jobs and to appoint, as an example, professors of secondary education. Only later (and there is widespread agreement on this point) under the scholarly leadership of professors like John Dewey, Paul Monroe, and Edward L. Thorndike were there attempts to create a coherent science or discipline of education. Both types of professors exist, of course, in most Schools of Education as perpetual sources of misunderstanding and antagonism.

Haberman and Stinnett produced, among other things, an historical treatment along with a good deal of editorializing and admonishing.[16] They agree with the role of Thorndike and Dewey but worry about how easily the educational professoriate fell into unfortunate university traditions with its diversity, specialization, and isolation allowing faculty desires to become "more important than program needs." Education professors become, they say with regret, like other professors.

Erwin Johanningmeier edited an "occasional paper" of the SPE in 1978, including several articles on the "Science of Education and the Educational Professoriate.[17] In this SPE publication J. R. Robarts explains that the quest for such a science was in part an attempt to solve the low status of the normal school teacher. Alanson Van Fleet focuses particularly on the work of Charles Judd at Illinois and his efforts to use science to give scholarly integrity to the work of the educational professoriate. In his "commentary" on the essays James Merritt fussed that education professors have overdone their attempts to make education a science. He wrote that it is like the

Fundamentalist Christian saying "Christ is the answer." The education professor wanders around proclaiming "science is the answer."

Katz and Sizer agree that the new professors of pedagogy mucked around in other people's compost piles. More eloquently Katz wrote that they were "poachers who trespassed on everybody's territory."[18]

> To borrow from other disciplines for the purposes of application would have been respectable; but although educationists claimed they were scientists, they refused to adhere to the rules of the scientific game as played in universities. In spite of their strident assertions that they were creating a discipline, they developed no distinctive mode of inquiry and refused to limit their territory. They claimed to be renaissance men. In an age when psychology, sociology, economics, political science, history, and philosophy were all becoming more esoteric and specialized, educationists increasingly asserted that they had the right to dip into everyone else's bag.

Borrowman in his SPE essay begins on a disquieting note--"It is not necessary to assume that professors of education will long exist." (Not necessary for whom, I mutter to myself.) He points out that they came into academia because of a phenomenal need for teachers between 1870 and 1930 and were a kind of crash "training cadre." The other faculties never really considered them legitimate; they were tolerated "as a necessary if somewhat embarrassing nuisance." After all someone had to train teachers "and since only the professor of education would take it on, they must be tolerated."[19]

Counelis, an institutional research analyst, gives us a generally rosy report on the education professoriate, full of statistics (I.Q. score for all doctorates 130.8, for education doctorates 123.3) and charts. He concludes that[20]

> The professor of education tends to be older, slightly less able, and more broadly educated than many of his compeers across a college or university campus. His work in training lower school professionals has been quantitatively large. Teacher education appears to have been done competently. However, his records on graduate education at the doctoral level and in significant educational research across the board have been considerably less than optimal. In a university coloring book, you can color the professor of education brilliant grey.

The article of Ducharme and Agne was particularly intriguing. They examine "the preparation, experience, workload, scholarly productivity," and status of education professors and compare them with faculty in other disciplines. They gathered data from the education faculty at "an East Coast state university, a Southeastern liberal arts college, a Far West state university, a Midwestern state university, a historic Black institution, a Southwestern university, and a Southern regional university." They, too, found the education professoriate to be caught in the double bind of the two cultures: "They are perceived by field practitioners as aloof from or out of touch with the field and current practice while perceived by campus colleagues in other units as too field focused, too pragmatic, too 'unscholarly.'"[21] They are a different species with different habits.

The quality and quantity of research by the educational professoriate compared to other professors is a traditional cause of the low esteem with which they held. Finkelstein says that their scholarly efforts "are too often ridiculed, spurned, ignored, or, worse yet, cited as examples of what research should not be. The products of scholarly effort," she continues, "are commonly understood to be badly written, poorly conceptualized, devoid of conceptual rigor, and focused on foolish questions."[22] Milton Schwebel, in a revealing comparative study of research productivity between education professors and others, argues that the low status of education has caused "an acute susceptibility to the blandishments of measurability (with its appearance of rigor and its status of respectability)."[23] The quantity of research is, of course, easier to measure. Fulton and Trow found that, based on publication, the educational professoriate ranked below professors in all other subject fields except fine arts and what they call the "semi-professions." They found that this lower productivity was true in all types

of institutions except junior colleges, where the education professor publishes more than most, which is little cause to cheer since little was published by professors in any discipline at this level.[24] Schwebel's data suggest that the education professoriate is more productive in textbook publishing but less in the preparation of articles than faculty in most other disciplines. In an 1983 article Schneider and Raths bring us back to the problem of the two cultures. They point out that many universities have a large cadre of tenured faculty who were "socialized as trainers of teachers" when a teacher shortage existed, often lacking research skills in a scholarly discipline, they are now criticized "for not having the appropriate goals and qualities for the present demands" in research universities.[25]

There is some literature on women in the education professoriate. The Weidmans conducted a statistical study which examined differences in social background and career patterns between the sexes. They didn't find many differences in social background, but they insist that women are discriminated against in rank and salary--with discrimination "more pervasive in universities than in four-year colleges."[26] Marsicano writes that one of the greatest disadvantages of women in academia is the lack of mentors--men prefer to mentor their own gender.[27] And Mary Cain engages in some vintage, hard core women's lib stuff--"some of my best friends are white males."[28] In typical turn-of-the-decade rhetoric, she admonishes that raising men's consciousness is the first step to equity for the woman education professor.

Most women and black professors are in education. Indeed James Anderson found that 60% of black doctorates in education before 1951 were awarded to women. The black doctorate and professoriate in education is the topic of a 1984 SPE Monograph.[29] Anderson made the valuable contribution in the publication. He provides what he calls "a definitive bibliography" (always

welcome) on doctoral research in education from 1925 to 1951 by black scholars, finding that 206 of the 261 dissertations focused on "some aspect of black life and culture." Much of the early literature was on the educability of blacks. He returns to his long-time ambivalence with the General Education Board and the Rosenwald Fund, recognizing that their grants made graduate study possible for hundreds of talented blacks in the 1920's and 1930's but accusing them of being "racially paternalistic" in steering blacks toward doctorates in teacher education.

Before proposals for raising the status of the education professoriate can be entertained, we should try to determine if their lower esteem is endemic to educators of teachers for the lower schools--certainly not an easy, perhaps an impossible, assignment. Some evidence may be garnered by looking at teacher educators in other nations. My attempt to get such an international perspective on the education professoriate was unsuccessful in that little literature on the topic was found.

Because of the lack of literature on the educational professoriate, I examined some of the closely-related literature on the university professoriate in general and on teacher education. There is considerable literature in English on the foreign professoriate generally--see, especially, a special issue of Higher Education on the "Academic Professor in Comparative Perspective," which includes articles on the professoriate of Germany, America, Italy, Japan, Latin America, and India but little on professors of education.[30]

Although I read widely but not deeply on teacher education abroad, I concentrated on England and on the Soviet bloc. Surely these two cultures are sufficiently different from each other to give a comparative perspective. I was alert to the danger of the ignorant falling victim to false cognates in

foreign places as well as in the past. On the other hand, I discovered that what appears at first glance to be strange, even bizarre, may be a very familiar perspective. As an example, much of the teacher education literature on the Soviet bloc stresses the need to indoctrinate the young in Marxist-Leninist theory. At first blush it seems so alien:[31]

> The graduate of the pedagogic school will teach and rear young citizens....Consequently, he needs to be deliberately trained in the perspectives of the development of our society....The graduate of the pedagogic school is the warrior of the ideological front, the bearer of party ideas. He must possess a high communist consciousness, sound skills in mass political and upbringing work, and inward strivings for constant improvement of his knowledge, including Marxist-Leninist theory.

We must remember, however, that the role of the American public school teacher has had much more to do with imparting values and attitudes--particularly the passing on of the Protestant ethic--than it has had to do with the development of intellectual skills. Social control, or more neutrally, socialization into the American way, may well have been the major responsibility of the American teacher through at least the last century.

Comparisons between teacher education in Europe and America must be done cautiously to avoid comparing unlike categories. The variety of institutions training teachers does appear to be more like the situation in America at the turn of the century when we had two-year normal schools, four-year normal schools, teachers colleges, and universities, among other institutions training teachers. Education roles and the status of the "professors" in such institutions varied widely.

Although the move is to greater standardization in degree-granting institutions in Europe, teacher education is not unequivocally in higher education. Some institutions in France and the USSR have extremely high status.[32] In the Soviet Union, however, some elementary teachers are still being trained in pedagogic schools (which admit students who have completed

eight years of schooling), pedagogic institutions, (now considered part of higher education, but which only a few years ago were closer to our old normal school), and universities. Some of the pedagogic institutions seem to have relatively high status--those of Moscow, Minsk, and Gorki are sometimes cited as examples--but many suffer the contempt heaped on our backwoods normal schools a few years ago. A Soviet writer sums it up:[33]

> No proposals for improving the work of the pedagogic institutes will have a chance of success unless we stop looking on them as second-rate institutions, for whose work blackboards and chalk in the classrooms are enough.

Colleges of Education in England, according to F. H. Hilliard, are still looked on as training institutions rather than as higher education. Donald Lomas adds that "the feeling that the majority of teachers are being trained in institutions which are markedly inferior in status to universities" is the cause of "considerable indignation" among many teachers.[34] Both school teaching and teacher-education have familiar low esteem. There appears to be little study and consideration of the status of the educational professoriate in relation to the professoriate in the wider university system. Lynch and Plunkett treat this issue briefly.[35] They report that teacher education institutions in England, France, and West Germany have a marginal status similar to that of corresponding institutions in the United States. In these countries, as here, professional education in teachers' colleges is generally thought to be purely vocational in function. Therefore, education, as an academic discipline, does not rank with other academic disciplines in the wider university system. Lomas reports that problems of status in teacher education "are endemic in Europe."[36] A Soviet writer complains "that university students regard teaching with contempt, and avoid it in every possible way." Another complains, have you heard it before, that universities don't take teacher education seriously, that students are poorly prepared in

pedagogy and methods, and, among university students, there is a widely held sentiment, "If I can't get a job in science, I'll be a teacher."[37]

Education students in Britain are below those of other university students in academic ability. And, as in America, they are more likely to be of working class background. As Hilliard explains, the lower status of the British educational professoriate in Colleges of Education may, in part, be because they are former teachers, many coming directly from school classrooms, again much like our situation a few decades ago.

Prescriptions for the problems of low regard parallel those in the United States. Edgar Stones calls the low esteem "a central problem" in the United Kingdom. His solution is to focus on pedagogy rather than what he sees as largely irrelevant professional educational studies: if you have a serious teaching problem, don't go to the "educational studies department for help," he warns; "They are too busy transmitting information about the sayings of the educational sages to address themselves to the questions."[38]

Obviously, all that I have gotten from a review of this literature are some clues or hints about the educational professoriate abroad. I found little to indicate that his prestige is greater than in the United States. It is difficult to understand the relative status of the teacher of pedagogy from the educational literature anyway--it is a part of the folklore of higher education. Perhaps it's true that you really do have to be there.

JAN 13 1986

Notes

[1]James D. Koermer, The Miseducation of American Teachers. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1965, p. 37.

[2]Arthur G. Powell, and Theodore R. Sizer, "Changing Conceptions of the Professor of Education." In James Steve Counelis, ed., To Be a Phoeneix: The Education Professoriate. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa, 1969, p.61.

[3]James Steve Counelis, ed., To Be a Phoenix: The Education Professoriate. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa, 1969, p. vi.

[4]Ayres Bagley, The Professor of Education: An Assessment of Conditions. Minneapolis: Society of Professors of Education, 1975.

[5]Merle L. Borrowman, The Liberal and Technical in Teacher Education. New York: Teachers College Bureau of Publications, 1965.

[6]J. Pickle, "Perspectives of Educators Across Clinical and Scholarly/ Scientific Work Settings." College Student Journal, 17 (1981), p. 194.

[7]Barbara Finkelstein, "Technicians, Mandarians, and Witnesses: Searching for Professional Understanding." Journal of Teacher Education, 33: May-June, 1982.

[8]Philip W. Jackson, "Divided We Stand: Observations on the Internal Organization of the Education Professoriate." In Bagley, A., ed. The Professor of Education: An Assessment of Conditions.

[9]Finkelstein, p. 25.

[10]Powell and Sizer, p. 74.

[11]H. J. Walberg, "Training Education Professors for the Future." In James Steve Counelis, ed., To Be a Phoenix: The Education Professoriate.

[12]R. Howsam, et al. Educating a Profession. Washington: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1976.

[13]J. Gore, "Collegial Ambience: Its Necessity in Teacher Education." Journal of Teacher Education, 32:37-9, May/June, 1981, p. 39.

[14]E. V. Johanningmeier, and H. C. Johnson Jr., "The Education Professoriate: A Historical Consideration of Its Work and Growth." In Bagley, A., ed. The Professor of Education: An Assessment of Conditions.

[15]A. G. Powell, and T. Sizer, "Changing Conceptions of the Professor of Education." In James Steve Counelis, ed., To Be a Phoenix: The Education Professoriate.

[16]Martin Haberman, and T. M. Stinnet, Teacher Education and the New Profession of Teaching. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1973.

[17] Erwin Johanningmeier, Ed., Science of Education and the Education Professoriate. Minneapolis: Society of Professors of Education, 1978.

[18] Michael B. Katz, "From Theory to Survey in Graduate Schools of Education." Journal of Higher Education, 36 (1966), p. 331.

[19] Merle L. Borrowman, "About Professors of Education." In Bagley, A., Ed., The Professor of Education: An Assessment of Conditions, p. 58.

[20] J. S. Counelis, "The Professorate in the Discipline of Education." In James Steve Counelis, Ed., To Be A Phoenix: The Education Professoriate, p. 22.

[21] E. R. Ducharme, and R. U. Agne, "Education Professoriate: A Research Based Perspective." Journal of Teacher Education, 33:30-6, November/December, 1982, p. 32.

[22] Finkelstein, p.25.

[23] M. Schwebel, "Research Productivity of Education Faculty: A Comparative Study." Educational Studies, 13:224-39, Summer, 1982.

[24] Oliver Fulton, and Martin Trow, "Research in American Higher Education." Sociology of Education, 47:29-73, Winter, 1974.

[25] B. L. Schneider, and J. Raths, "Teacher Educators: Do They Have A Place in Research Oriented Universities?" The High School Journal, 66 (1983), 70-82.

[26] C. S. Weidman, and J. C. Weidman, "Professors of Education: Some Social and Occupational Characteristics." In Bagley, A., Ed., The Professor of Education: An Assessment of Conditions, p. 89.

[27] Hazel E. Marsicano, "Role of Mentors in Developing Careers: Do Women Need Mentors?" Paper presented at the West Virginia University Council on Women's Concerns--A Conference on Women's Career Management: Challenges and Decision. ED203132.

[28] M. A. Cain, "Affirmative Action, Women, and the Education Professoriate." In Bagley, A., Ed., The Professor of Education: An Assessment of Conditions, p. 107.

[29] James D. Anderson, "Toward a History and Bibliography of the Afro-American Doctorate and Professoriate in Education, 1896 to 1980." In A. Bagley, The Black Education Professoriate. Minneapolis: Society of Professors of Education, 1984.

[30] Higher Education (Special Issue on the Academic Profession in Comparative Perspective) VI (May, 1977).

[31] Quoted in Nigel Grant, "Teacher Training in the USSR and Eastern Europe." Comparative Education, 8, April, 1972.

[32]David E. Lomas, The Education of Teachers in Britian. London: John Wiley and Sons, 1973.

[33]Quoted in Grant, p. 15.

[34]F. H. Hilliard, Ed., Teaching the Teachers: Trends in Teacher Education. London: George Allen and Unwin LTD, 1971; and Lomas, p.7.

[35]James Lynch, and H. Dudley Plunkett, Teacher Education and Cultural Change: England, France, West Germany. CT: Linnet Books, 1973.

[36]Lomas, p. 21.

[37]Quoted in Grant, p. 15.

[38]Edgar Stones, "Teacher Education and Pedagogy." Journal of Education for Teaching, 7, October, 1981, p. 225.